REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated June 30, 2005. Claims 1 and 4-14 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 4-6, 13, and 14 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Claims 1, 13, and 14 are independent.

At paragraphs 3 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner maintains the objection to the specification, again stating that Japanese patent application laid-open No. 10-051651 is "implicitly incorporated" by reference.

First, in the Amendment filed on February 7, 2005, Applicant amended the reference at page 15 of the original application, to the Kokai to make it explicit that it is an incorporation by reference. Applicant therefore does not understand why the Office Action maintains that the incorporation by reference is "implicit".

Second, the Examiner states, at paragraph 3: "The issue is that (1) Japanese patent application laid-open No. 10-051651 is a foreign application and (2) it contains essential material, such as the step of analyzing recited in Claim 1."

Claim 1 recites, in part, "analyzing whether compressed data contained in a drawing instruction corresponds to an image attribute, a text attribute or a graphics attribute by discriminating a format of the compressed data". That is, it is *compressed* data that is being analyzed in Claim 1, for which there is an explicit description in the specification. On the other hand, the reference to the Kokai in the specification is in relation to analyzing data *other than* compressed data. For example it is noted that the specification (as filed) states the following at pages 15-16:

> If the drawing instructions contain compressed data, a format of each compressed data is analyzed to judge an attribute of the image concerned. If the drawing instructions contain data <u>other than compressed data</u>, an attribute of each image is judged according to the kind of each drawing instruction in a manner as described in Japanese patent application laid-open No. 10-051651. (emphasis added)

Therefore, since the reference to the Kokai in the specification is in relation to analyzing data *other than* compressed data, while Claim 1 recites analyzing *compressed* data, it is submitted that the objection is improper, as no "essential disclosure" is missing from the application. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.[1]

Claim 6 was objected to for depending (in the alternative) from canceled Claim 2. Applicant has corrected this informality kindly pointed out by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 3-8, 11, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 5,539,865 (Gentile) in view of Japanese Patent Laid-Open 08-278876A (Ota); Claim 9, as being obvious from Gentile and Ota in view of U.S. Patent 6,493,028 (Anderson); Claim 10, as being obvious from Gentile and Ota in view of U.S. Patent 6,124,944 (Ohta); and Claim 12, as being obvious from Gentile and Ota in view of U.S. Patent 6,009,209 (Acker).

Claim 1 is directed to an image processing method for performing correction processing according to an attribute of an image. The method includes analyzing whether compressed data contained in a drawing instruction corresponds to an image attribute, a text attribute or a graphics attribute by discriminating a format of the compressed data. The compressed data is developed to a bit map using a method corresponding to an obtained analysis result, and correction processing is performed on the bit map according to the attribute identified on the basis of the analysis result.

One notable feature of Claim 1 is analyzing whether compressed data contained in a drawing instruction corresponds to an image attribute, a text attribute or a graphics attribute by discriminating a format of the compressed data. See, for example,

---

[1] It is noted that the Office Action does not in any way respond to the content of Applicant's arguments made in traversal of this objection in the previous Office Action. Should the Examiner maintain this objection, it is requested that he kindly provide such response.

Fig. 10, step S10-1.[2] Applicant submits that nothing has been found, or pointed out, in either Gentile or Ota, whether considered separately or in any permissible combination (if any), that would teach or suggest this analyzing step.

Gentile, as understood by Applicant, relates to processing data for a visual-output device, in which a digital output processing system has compression and decompression mechanisms. A page of data may include image, graphics, and text (and may include regions containing a combination of those types). The page is divided into the regions of the different types, which are compressed using appropriate techniques and stored (see Fig. 3). Apparently, in Gentile, the text, graphics, and image data are a bitmap area. More specifically, in Gentile, the compression mechanism suitable for each type of data is selected, and the decompression is performed with respect to the compressed bitmap area by selecting the decompression mechanism according to the selected compression mechanism. Generally, then, Gentile discusses that the decompression mechanism is selected based on the compression mechanism.

Ota relates to a system in which a color process is performed according to the attribute information.

However, Applicant submits that nothing has been found or pointed out in either Gentile or Ota, whether considered either separately or in any permissible combination (if any), that would teach or suggest analyzing whether compressed data contained in a drawing instruction corresponds to an image attribute, a text attribute or a graphics attribute by discriminating a format of the compressed data, as recited in Claim 1. It is noted that, as explained above, Gentile merely discusses selecting a decompression mechanism based on the compression mechanism, which does not teach or suggest an

_____

2/It is of course to be understood that the references to various portions of the present application are by way of illustration and example only, and that the claims are not limited by the details shown in the portions referred to.

analysis of whether compressed data corresponds to one of the three specific attributes (image, text, or graphics) by discriminating the format of the compressed data. <u>Ota</u>, even if the proposed combination with <u>Gentile</u> would be permissible, would not supply what is missing from <u>Gentile</u>. Accordingly, not only is the method of Claim 1 not suggested by these two documents, but the result obtained from the method of Claim 1 also cannot be attained by the proposed combination of <u>Gentile</u> and <u>Ota</u> (namely that a high-speed process can be achieved without any load to the process because it is unnecessary to analyze the attribute of the compressed data after decompressing the relevant data).

Accordingly, Clam 1 is believed to be patentable over <u>Gentile</u> and <u>Ota</u>, whether considered separately or in any permissible combination (if any).

Independent Claims 13 and 14 are storage medium and apparatus claims, respectively, corresponding to method Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from Claim 1, and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 532960v1